

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Nedbank Ltd v Senne and Others

(2151/10)

[2010] ZANWHC 41 (17 December 2010)

[2010] ZANWHC 41

COURT

North West High Court, Mafikeng

BEFORE

A A Landman

CASE / FILE NUMBER

2151/10

Source: saflii.org · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

Source record

IN THE NORTH
WEST HIGH COURT
MAFIKENG
CASE NO.
2151/10
In the matter

between:

NEDBANK LIMITED
.....PLAINTIFF
and
PAAP ABEDNIGO
SENNE NO
.....1ST
DEFENDANT
ARTHUR BEN HUMA
NO
.....2ND
DEFENDANT
PHILEMON
MACHENG KHUNOU NO
.....3RD
DEFENDANT
OBED ANDREW
SEKOATI
NO.....
4TH DEFENDANT
CORNELIUS
SHIMANE KHUNOU NO

.....5TH
DEFENDANT
BHESSEL JOSIA
MAKGATLHA
NO.....6TH
DEFENDANT
CONSTANCE
FRANCINA HUMA NO
.....7TH
DEFENDANT
TAYFIN ABOO NO
REPRESENTED BY MAHOME
MAHIER TAYOB
.....8TH
DEFENDANT
PHILEMON
MACHENG KHUNOU
.....9TH
DEFENDANT
MATSHIDISO
EDITH KHUNOU
.....10TH
DEFENDANT
MOKETE
FREDERICK MODIMOKWANE
.....11TH
DEFENDANT
MOTLADILE
JEANETTE MODIMOKWANE12TH
DEFENDANT
ARTHUR BEN HUMA
.....13TH
DEFENDANT
ZIPPORAH
MAMGIAL HUMA
.....14TH
DEFENDANT
PAAPA ABEDNEGO
SENNE
.....15TH
DEFENDANT
MAMOI VINOLIA
SENNE
.....16TH
DEFENDANT
GEORGE SHIMANE
KHUNOU
.....17TH
DEFENDANT
MOSONNGOA
STELLA EMILY MONTY KHUNOU18TH

DEFENDANT
DATE OF HEARING
: 9 DECEMBER 2010
DATE OF
JUDGMENT : 17 DECEMBER 2010
FOR THE
PLAINTIFF : MR M WESSELS
FOR THE
DEFENDANTS : NO APPEARANCE

JUDGMENT

LANDMAN J:

- [1] The plaintiff, Nedbank Ltd, issued a summons out of this court on 22 September 2010 against the 18 (eighteen) defendants. Nedbank alleged that the defendants are jointly and severally liable for payment of R1 056 115.10 being the balance due and owing in respect of monies lent and advanced by Nedbank to the first to eight defendants (being Trustees for the time being of the Fike Trust, the owner of mortgage property) in terms of a loan agreement secured by a mortgage bond. The ninth to eighteenth defendants are alleged to have bonded themselves jointly and severally for an unlimited amount as sureties and co-principal debtors in solidum for repayment of any monies which may be owed to Nedbank by the Trust.
- [2] The summons was served upon the defendants in October 2010. On 2 November 2010 the assistant Master of the North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria provided, on form J246, letters of authority for the Fike Trust showing that the Trustees were: The 2nd, 4th, 5th and 6th defendants as well as Khosi Moses Diale and Moshanti Martin Makgale.
- [3] A notice of substitution in terms of Rule 15(3) dated 3 December 2010 was filed indicating that this action would proceed against the current Trustees who were named. In November 2010 the summons was served on the 9th, 13th, 15th and another defendant having his or her address at 174 Photsaneng. The return has been amended by hand and I am unable to determine to whom this return relates.
- [4] The 6th and 9th defendants entered appearance to defend the matter on 3 November 2010.
- [5] On 23 November 2010 a notice of application for summary judgment was delivered to the attorney for the 6th and 9th defendants. The application was filed with the Registrar on 24 November. The affidavit in support of the application is dated 19 October 2010. The deponent, Ms Sharon Janse van Rensburg, says in paragraph 4:

“In my opinion there is no bona fide defence to the action and that the Notice of Intention to Defend has been delivered solely for the purposes of delay.”

- [6] The first aspect which requires attention is the fact that the plaintiff's affidavit alleges that the 6th to 9th defendants entered appearance to defend simply to delay the process. This, in so far as it relates to the entry of appearance to defend, is factually incorrect as no appearance to defend had been entered when the affidavit was commissioned. However, as there has been no appearance for the defendants and no affidavits have been filed, I am of the view that this defect is not a fatal one.
- [7] Secondly there is the issue of joinder. All the Trustees have been joined as is required. See *Moriolo and Others v Kage-Eddie NO and Others* 1995
- (2) SA 728 (W) at 731E and *Van der Westhuizen v Sandwyk* 1996
- (2) SA 490 (W). Trustees are obliged to act unanimously. Minority rule or majority rule is not permitted. See *Coetzee v Peet Smith Trust* 2003 (5) SA 674 (T).
- [8] The situation here is that only one trustee, the 6th defendant, has entered appearance to defend. Although this step is a nominal one and probably done with the intention of delaying judgment, it has the effect that summary judgment can only be granted against one trustee, and a separate application would need to be made to obtain default judgment against the remaining Trustees. It seems to me that, although the judgment may only be executed against the property of the Fike Trust, that, I should grant summary judgment against the 6th defendant which shall be jointly and severally with any judgment that may be entered against the remaining current Trustees.
- [9] As for the 9th defendant I will grant judgment against him jointly and severally with the judgment granted against the 6th defendant.
- [10] In the result:
1. Summary judgment is granted against the 6th and 9th defendants jointly and severally for:
 - 1.1 Payment of the amount of R1 056 115.10.
 - 1.2 Interest on the amount of R1 056 115.10 at 9% (prime less 1%) per annum from 05 August 2010 to date of payment.
 - 1.3 An order declaring the mortgaged property referred to in the summons executable for the said sums and costs.
 - 1.4 Costs on an attorney and client scale, to be taxed, plus Sheriff's charges and collection commission as provided for in the Mortgage Bond.
 2. The judgment granted against the 6th defendant shall be joint and several with any judgment which might be granted against the remaining Trustees whose names are set out on form J246 issued on 2 November 2010 by the Master in respect of the Fike Trust.

A A LANDMAN

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

ATTORNEYS:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF : VAN ROOYEN TLHAPI & WESSELS

FOR THE DEFENDANTS : SM MOOKELETSI.

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZANWHC/2010/41.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/nedbank-ltd-v-senne-and-others-unknown-topic-anwhc-2010>

Prepared on 13 October 2026 · Esheria